DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 056 SP 010 616

AUTHOR Tainton, Barry E.; Turner, Terence J.
TITLE Transfer Systems: The Opinions of Queensland Teachers. Evaluation Series.
INSTITUTION Queensland Dept. of Education, Brisbane (Australia).
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 46p.; Study conducted by the Committee Investigating a Teacher Transfer System

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Problems; Faculty Mobility; *Foreign Countries; *Incentive Systems; National Surveys; Premium Pay; Questionnaires; Salary Differentials; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Employment; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Placement; *Teacher Transfer; Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (Queensland)

ABSTRACT

Data from research conducted by the Department of Education, Queensland, shows that over 90% of the state's teachers support an entirely voluntary system of transfer, 68% favor obligatory transfer for positions that cannot be filled by volunteers, and 45% support a completely compulsory scheme of teacher transfer. A sample of 957 teachers were questioned on (1) alternative systems of transfer, (2) factors influencing the choice of teaching site, (3) factors exempting a teacher from remote area service, (4) incentives that might attract teachers to unpopular service areas. Factors influencing teachers in their choice of assignment site were the availability of educational facilities for their children, employment or tertiary education for children, cost of living, employment for spouse, proximity to friends and family, cultural and professional facilities. Listed as exemption factors were ill health, sole support of parent, university attendance, education needs of teacher's children, and marriage of female teachers. Incentives thought influential were salary loading, housing, long service leave, travel, and family education concessions. (MB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131056

TRANSFER SYSTEMS:

THE OPINIONS OF QUEENSLAND TEACHERS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Barry E. Tainton
Terence J. Turner

Research Branch
Department of Education, Queensland

This study was conducted for the Committee Investigating a Teacher Transfer System

June 1976

SP010 616

CONTENTS

List of Tables	(iii)
Introduction	1
Significance of the Problem	1
Previous Research	4
Method	5
Results	7
Alternative Transfer System	7
Factors Influencing Transfer	9
Relationships between Factors Influencing Transfer and Teachers' Preferences	11
Incentives	12
Compulsion in Transfer	16
Conclusions	19
References	22
Appendix 1	23
Appendix 2	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Staff Turnover, Qualifications and Experience of Metropolitan and Country High School Teachers	2
Table 2:	Attitudes Towards Transfer Systems Based Upon Incentives	7
Table 3:	Perceived Importance of Factors Influencing Transfer	9
Table 4:	Teachers' Rating of Incentives to Teach in Undesirable Locations	13
Table 5:	Teachers' Opinions on Possible Exemptions from Service in Remote Areas	16
Table 2.1:	Locality Allowances for Married Male Officers	26
Table 2.2:	Representativeness of Sample, by Sex and Type of School	26
Table 2.3:	Characteristics of Weighted Sample by Marital Status, Spouse Information, Family, Age and Location of School of Teacher	27
Table 2.4:	Attitudes to Obligatory System of Transfer by Age and School Status of Teacher	27
Table 2.5:	Attitudes to Obligatory System of Transfer, by Marital Status of Teacher	27
Table 2.6:	Attitudes to Voluntary System of Transfer, by Age and School Status of Teacher	28
Table 2.7:	Teachers' Preferences for Next Transfer – Mean Rankings of Areas and Percentage of Total First Preferences	28
Table 2.8:	Perceived Importance of Availability of Secondary Education, by Age and Marital Status of Teacher	29
Table 2.9:	Perceived Importance of Availability of Secondary Education and Employment for Children, by Family of Teacher	29
Table 2.10:	Perceived Importance of Children's Employment or Tertiary Education, by Age and Marital Status of Teacher	30
Table 2.11	Perceived Importance of Cost of Living, by Sex, and Spouse Information of Teacher, and Location of School	30
Table 2.12	Perceived Importance of Spouse Employment, by Marital Status of Teacher	31
Table 2.13:	Perceived Importance of Spouse Employment, by Sex, Age, Family and School Status of Teacher	31
Table 2.14:	Perceived Importance of Cultural and Professional Facilities, by Sex, Age, and School Status of Teacher, and Location of School	32
Table 2.15:	Perceived Importance of Locality Allowance, by Sex of Teacher	32
Table 2.16:	Perceived Importance of Factors Influencing Transfer, by Queensland and South Australian Teachers	33
Table 2.17:	Correlations Among Preferences for Transfer Locality and Factors Influencing Transfer – Primary, Pre-School and Special Teachers	34

Table 2.18:	Correlations Among Preferences for Transfer Locality and Factors Influencing Transfer – Secondary Teachers	34
Table 2.19:	Attitudes to a Points System, by Location of School	35
Table 2.20:	Perceived Importance of Salary Loading as an Incentive, by Age and Location of School of Teacher	35
Table 2.21:	Perceived Importance of Salary Loading, by Location of School of Teachers Aged 26–35 Years Old	36
Table 2.22:	Perceived Importance of Extra Long Service Leave as an Incentive, by Sex and Marital Status of Teacher	36
Table 2.23:	Perceived Importance of Travel Concessions as an Incentive, by Marital Status of Teacher and Location of School	36
Table 2.24:	Perceived Importance of Education Concessions as an Incentive, by Teacher's Marital Status and Family	37
Table 2.25:	Perceived Importance of Low Interest Government Loan as an Incentive, by Marital Status of Teacher	37
Table 2.26:	Perceived Importance of Professional Facilities as an Incentive, by Sex and Age of Teacher	37
Table 2.27:	Perceived Importance of Accelerated Promotion as an Incentive, by Sex of Teacher	38
Table 2.28:	Perceived Importance of a Points System as an Incentive, by School Status of Teacher	38
Table 2.29:	Perceived Importance of Incentives, by Queensland and South Australian Teachers	38
Table 2.30:	Attitudes to University Studies as a Sufficient Reason for Exemption from Transfer, by Age, Sex and Spouse Information of Teacher	39
Table 2.31:	Attitudes to University Studies as a Sufficient Reason for Exemption, by Location of School by Age of Teacher – Teachers under 26 Years of Age	39
Table 2.32:	Attitudes to Educational Needs of Children as a Sufficient Reason for Transfer by Age, Sex, Marital Status and Family of Teacher	40
Table 2.33:	Attitudes to Marriage of Females as a Sufficient Reason for Exemption from Transfer, by Sex, Age and Spouse Information of Teacher	40
Table 2.34:	Attitudes to Marriage of Males as a Sufficient Reason for Exemption from Transfer, by Age and Family of Teacher	41
Table 2.35:	Attitudes to Preference for City Location as a Sufficient Reason for Exemption from Transfer, by Age and Marital Status of Teacher	41

INTRODUCTION

In 1974, the Director-General of Education in Queensland established a committee to inquire into various aspects of teacher transfer systems. The committee, known as the Committee Investigating a Teacher Transfer System, was comprised of representatives of the Queensland Department of Education and the Queensland Teachers' Union. The Committee will be referred to here as "the Joint Committee".

To assist them in making recommendations on changes to the present transfer system in Queensland, the Joint Committee constructed a questionnaire seeking teacher opinion on:

(i) factors influencing a teacher's choice of a place to teach;
(ii) factors that should exempt a teacher from transfer to remote areas;
(iii) the incentives which might attract teachers to unpopular areas; and
(iv) a voluntary system of transfer.

Upon request by the Joint Committee, the Research Branch of the Department of Education conducted a survey of teacher opinion using the Joint Committee's questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix 1.

Significance of the Problem

The Queensland Department of Education is charged with the responsibility of staffing all schools in the state with professionally educated teachers in accordance with the policy that equal educational opportunity should exist for all children irrespective of their home location.

The Department of Education has the authority to effect the transfers of teachers, regardless of their wishes, since every prospective teacher signs an agreement to serve anywhere in the State. Recently, those responsible for administering the transfer system in Queensland have given increasing opportunities for teachers likely to be transferred in the near future to indicate their preferences for localities. Teachers desirous of remaining in their present school, or of choosing a more attractive location, have reasonable prospects of achieving these ambitions if substantial argument can be produced.

However, pursuance of the policy of equal educational opportunity for all children has meant the transfer of many teachers to schools or localities which they did not desire and for which they did not indicate any preference. To staff a total of 1346 schools and satisfy the wishes of over 17 000 teachers is a Herculean task and it is inevitable that some teachers are transferred unwillingly to areas where few volunteer for service.

The Queensland Teachers Union believes that, due to a variety of related factors (the existing transfer system being one), children from country areas of Queensland are receiving less than equal opportunity in their education (Queensland Teachers Union, 1974).

Specific factors which are asserted to have a negative effect upon the quality of country children's education include:

(i) high staff turnover;
(ii) less than an equal share of experienced and highly qualified teachers;
(iii) lack of availability of guidance and specialist teaching staff;
(iv) reduced or non-existent employment for youths;
(v) fewer higher educational opportunities for children;
(vi) and professional isolation of teachers.

The concern displayed by the QTU for these problems is mirrored in the Schools Commission Report (Schools Commission, 1975). The Commission pointed to the restricted employment opportunities, limited secondary education opportunities, and the absence of specialised services both to teachers and children, as factors in the disadvantageness of country pupils. The Report went on:

> *Teachers, particularly those originating in the major urban areas, often find a posting in the more remote country areas of Australia unwelcome. A number of problems compound a desire on the part of the teacher to live in the more populous areas. Such problems as difficulty in obtaining decent housing, isolation from colleagues, high costs of living, high costs of returning to home centres for holidays and living in a community with somewhat alien interests and values all lead to a situation where many teachers seek to leave country areas as soon as their required time has been completed. Thus few teachers stay long enough to completely understand the needs of students in their environment and to fashion programs appropriate to them. Country schools also have more than their fair share of younger and inexperienced teachers and in the main, these teachers have fewer professional qualifications than their city counterparts . . . A high proportion of staff in country schools consists of young teachers under bond who are subject to direction in their postings. The phasing out of bonding which is occurring in most States has serious implications for the staffing of country schools. In the least favoured areas incentives of various kinds will be needed to attract staff as well as reduce the existing high rate of turnover. (p. 78).*

Some supporting evidence for the incidence of some of these problems comes from a survey of a number of high schools throughout Queensland, a summary of which appears in Table 1.

TABLE 1: STAFF TURNOVER, QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE OF METROPOLITAN AND COUNTRY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Type of School	PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS AT SCHOOL				
	Staff Turnover Between Nov. 1973 and Feb. 1974	Four-year Trained Teachers	Teaching Experience 1 year or less	2-5 years	6+ years
Metropolitan High Schools	31.0	40.5	9.4	33.6	57.0
Country High Schools	43.8	26.7	19.7	50.5	29.4

Note.— Data quoted from Queensland Teachers Union (1974).

The claims of the Queensland Teachers Union, then, that country schools experience considerable staff turnover and are staffed with disproportionate numbers of young teachers, are by no means unjustified. Many would agree, too, that this is undesirable: overseas research has demonstrated that teacher experience correlates positively and teacher turnover negatively, with student achievement (Walberg, 1974).

Many factors are considered to contribute to the twin problems of high teacher turnover and inexperienced teachers. The Department of Education in Queensland has pursued a policy, endorsed by the Queensland Teachers Union, of limiting the service period in isolated areas. This policy, and the desire of some teachers to escape from adverse conditions, is, in part, responsible for a higher staff turnover in country schools. In addition, Departmental practice has been to transfer young, bonded, single teachers to regions away from their families, friends and recreational interests.

The shortage of teacher accommodation in country areas is seen to create further problems. Despite the steady progress made in recent years to alleviate problems of accommodation, especially for married staff teachers, the Schools Commission (1975) reported that the housing of teachers in country regions constituted a problem of "considerable dimensions (p. 70)." When disincentives such as higher cost of living, a lack of community services and facilities, and additional costs for children's education are taken into account, it can be appreciated why experienced staff teachers are not attracted to country areas other than for reasons of promotion.

While the Commission believes that the provision of adequate housing represents "an obvious beginning in the search for incentives (p. 79)," it is of the opinion that experimentation should be encouraged with other possibilities such as leave credits, subsidised air travel for vacations, assistance in gaining access to medical attention, and an overhaul of the promotion system to reduce its contribution to staff turnover.

In Queensland, the promotion system has a major effect on the geographical mobility of teachers. It is a widely held belief among teachers that those who wish to be promoted quickly must, in general, make themselves available for transfer to virtually any school within the state that has a suitable position vacant.

In this way, a number of positions in remote schools are filled by teachers seeking promotion. In secondary schools, such positions as principal, deputy principal and subject master invariably attract teachers of lower status from more favourable areas. In primary schools, a common promotional pattern is to commence as principal of a remote one-teacher school and progress gradually to larger schools and to less isolated locations. For both primary and secondary school promotion positions, teachers express preferences for school location and the transfer of these teachers may thus be classified as voluntary. However, for many positions in unfavoured schools, no promotion is involved and it is apparent that for experienced teachers to even consider applying for such positions, some incentive or compulsion is necessary.

The Queensland Teachers Union is an advocate of a voluntary system of transfer with incentives to attract and hold teachers in country areas. The Queensland Teachers Union believes that such incentives as housing benefits, salary loadings, and various types of concessions to provide for family needs would be an inducement to people to serve in outlying areas. Moreover, the Queensland Teachers Union holds that these benefits should guarantee a nett gain to teachers serving in such areas over what they would have received in more favoured locations.

In common with other public servants, teachers now receive a cost of living allowance in relation to distance from ports or manufacturing districts. Whether this is enough to more than offset the higher cost of living or even provide the equality for which it was originally intended, is debatable. However, because inflation has destroyed the real value of the allowance (which is further eroded by taxation), the rates have been reviewed recently. These may be seen in Appendix 2 as Table 2.1 which shows the rates for married male officers in selected centres both before and after 1 October 1975. It must be remembered that the present study was conducted when the old rates still applied.

Of course, any abolition of a compulsory transfer system is not, by itself, a panacea for improving the lot of country teachers and pupils. The complexity of the problems of a voluntary transfer system is reflected in the following question: How can children in country areas be provided with a reasonable proportion of experienced and highly qualified teachers who want to teach and who will remain for some considerable period of time in rural localities?

Previous Research

The paucity of research on the geographical mobility of teachers is by no means confined to Australia, as Charters (1963) has pointed out. However, there is at least evidence that for American teachers, "the most typical direction of movement has been from smaller to larger communities (Havighurst & Newgarten, 1957, p. 437)." Even two studies on teacher mobility in the USA conducted in the latter half of the sixties tended to raise more issues than they clarified. It would appear that researchers have not followed up these studies by Griffiths, Goldman and McFarland (1965) and Pederson (1970) with investigations into other educational systems.

Three recent studies in Australia seem pertinent to the present research project. Coverdale (1973) conducted a study into the determinants of teacher morale in New South Wales. He found that conditions of service, rather than salary or various material benefits, were the major concerns of teachers responding to his questionnaire: of 38 problems raised, salaries were ranked twentieth. The transfer system (with its accompanying feeling of insecurity for some teachers) and the promotion structure were, *inter alia*, ranked by the majority of respondents as highly important factors affecting teacher morale.

Campbell (1975), in a study of teacher morale, concluded that "the practice of transferring teachers is a major source of dissatisfaction (p. 58)."

In 1973, the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the South Australian Department of Education (Lloydd-Wright, personal communication, October 1975) jointly conducted a state-wide survey of teacher opinion and experience in an attempt to determine the nature of effective incentives for teachers to accept positions in what were regarded as unpopular localities. The study was also designed to ascertain the nature of both popular and unpopular regions and what factors caused these differences in popularity.

The South Australian survey was followed up by group discussions conducted by an independent firm of management consultants. In the interviews involving some 250 families, certain opinions about country teaching were found to be commonplace:

(i) housing needs upgrading;
(ii) further study is difficult;
(iii) country teaching imposes isolation and cultural and social deprivation;
(iv) much moving unsettles family; and
(v) there is difficulty in obtaining specialist medical treatment.

When these negative factors were reduced to monetary terms, country teachers viewed themselves as a financially disadvantaged group. Teachers interviewed believed that some positive discrimination in favour of country teachers was necessary to make country service more attractive and provide some stability in the staffing of schools.

Housing and salary loadings dominated discussions on incentives, with the improvement of professional facilities and opportunities for further study being an important third group.

Method

Unlike the South Australian survey where the questionnaire was sent to all teachers in the state, a sample of 1206 teachers was chosen to participate in the present study. In order to obtain a sufficient number of responses from teachers in areas regarded as remote, a sample of teachers, stratified by class of school, was selected. From within each class of smaller school (Class 4, 5 and 6), a random sample of 6 in every 10 teachers was chosen; from all Class 1, 2 and 3 primary and special schools, all pre-schools and all Class 1 and 2 secondary schools, a random sample of 1 in every 23 teachers was chosen.

While this sampling design ensured an adequate number of responses from teachers in small schools for conducting statistical tests of significance, the sample as it stood was not representative of the population of teachers. There were in fact 14.7 times too many teachers in Class 4, 5, and 6 schools. To offset this excessive number of teachers in small schools and thus to achieve a representative sample, a weight was applied to the responses of each teacher according to the class of school in which the teacher taught. The class of school weights were:

Class 4, 5, 6 schools	0.136
All other schools	1.864

The characteristics of the weighted sample are described in Tables 2.2 and 2.3. The sample was quite representative of the population of teachers in terms of sex of teacher and type of school. No information for the population was available for other background variables.

In all analyses conducted in this survey, it is this weighted sample that has been used. However, weighting is responsible for rounding errors. In order to facilitate readability, the tables presented in this report show the number of respondents rounded to the nearest whole number. Thus, for example, because of this rounding the percent of males plus the percent of females in a table may not total exactly to 100 percent, or the number of respondents in each category of a table may not sum exactly to the number of teachers in the sample.

A questionnaire, similar to that employed in the 1973 South Australian survey, was constructed by the Joint Committee and provided to the Research Branch for administration.

In addition to questions concerning the factors influencing a teacher's choice of a place to teach, the incentives which might attract teachers to unpopular locations and background information (all of which were a part of the South Australian survey), the Joint Committee decided that some indication of teachers' opinions on compulsory and voluntary aspects of the transfer system, and on what factors might exempt a teacher from transfer to remote areas, should be sought.

The anonymous questionnaires, each accompanied by an explanatory letter, were distributed in early August 1975. A total of 957 usable questionnaires was received by the date analysis was due to commence, and this represented a satisfactory response rate of 79 percent.

RESULTS

Alternative Transfer Systems

Both the Schools Commission and the Queensland Teachers Union have publicly stressed the importance of incentives of various kinds in attracting teachers to remote areas. The teachers in the sample were thus asked to rate the desirability of three transfer schemes based upon incentives. Attitudes of teachers towards the three transfer systems which ranged from a compulsory system to an entirely voluntary system are displayed in Table 2.

TABLE 2: ATTITUDES TOWARDS TRANSFER SYSTEMS BASED UPON INCENTIVES

	Transfer System	Percentage of Respondents	
		Supporting System	Not Supporting System
(i)	OBLIGATORY (with regard for genuine compassionate factors)	45.0	55.0
(ii)	OBLIGATORY (only after the position has failed to attract a volunteer)	68.2	31.8
(iii)	BY APPLICATION	91.7	8.3

The first transfer system in Table 2 is based upon compulsory transfer of teachers (except on compassionate grounds) with some benefits provided. Teachers were very much divided on this transfer system.

The relationships between characteristics of teachers and their opinions on alternative transfer systems, factors influencing transfer, and incentives were analysed. The teacher characteristics, used for all such analyses, are as follows:

(i) the sex of the teacher;
(ii) the age of the teacher;
(iii) the teacher's marital status;
(iv) the teacher's family (children, or no children)
(v) spouse employment;
(vi) the type of school (primary, secondary, pre-school, special);
(vii) the classification of the teacher's school (school size) ;
(viii) the teacher's school status (principal, deputy, subject master, infant mistress, class teacher);
(ix) location of the teacher's school (Brisbane, large coastal town, small coastal town, large inland town, small inland town, rural district).

Inspection of Table 2.4 reveals that there were significant differences among the teachers' attitudes to the first compulsory transfer system when the teacher's age and position in school were taken into account. It was the younger teacher (under 36) rather than the older, and those in classroom situations rather than those in classified positions who viewed this obligatory system less favourably.

Table 2 further illustrates that such a compulsory system was the least preferable of the three alternatives in the eyes of the teacher. Many teachers would have interpreted this system as one where no preferences for transfer were available. Others may have thought that it corresponded to the present transfer system (with additional benefits for remote area service) where principals and, to a lesser extent, teachers do have some opportunity to express preferences for locations if they think transfer or promotion is imminent. Which of the two possible interpretations influenced the respondents cannot be determined from this study. Nevertheless, it is clear that the majority of teachers, and the young in particular, did not find the obligatory nature of this transfer system attractive.

In contrast, the second alternative in Table 2 did attract a substantial proportion of teachers. A total of 68 percent of all teachers thought that if a position failed to attract a volunteer even after the provision of adequate incentives, the position should be filled on an obligatory basis by the direction there of a teacher. As Table 2.5 shows, single teachers reacted less favourably to this system than did married teachers. It must be remembered, of course, that when a teacher has to be transferred at short notice to fill some position in a remote area, it is usually more expedient to appoint a single person. In view of this current Departmental practice, the results of Table 2.5 are quite predictable.

The majority of teachers favouring this system possibly reflects one inherent problem of an entirely voluntary transfer scheme, *viz*, staffing all schools adequately. It might well be that the principle of equal educational opportunity for children, regardless of location, has exerted considerable influence over the teachers' opinions.

The third alternative presented to teachers was a virtually ideal system, whereby teachers are not transferred to a school unless they applied for transfer there. An overwhelming, but not surprising, 91.7 percent of all teachers favoured such a scheme. Teacher groups varied little in their opinions about this system, with two exceptions. Support for a voluntary system declined with age until only 67 percent of teachers over 55 years of age favoured transfer by application. Secondly, it was the teachers rather than those in classified positions who lent greatest support to this scheme (Table 2.6). Perhaps these differences stemmed from a belief by some that such a transfer system might not be capable of adequately staffing all schools in the state. However, while the differences among teachers illustrated by Table 2.6 are significant, it should be pointed out, that for every group of teachers, the proportion of respondents favouring transfer by application was higher than that for any other transfer system.

Factors Influencing Transfer

An entirely voluntary system of transfer stands or falls on the capability of such a system to staff all schools, regardless of location. In order to determine if all schools could be staffed without extending the present system of incentives, teachers were asked to rank ten schools in order of preference for their next transfer. The problem of staffing the more remote schools under a voluntary transfer system, without additional incentives, is illustrated by Table 2.7 which reveals that remote schools received very small proportions of all first preferences. The mean ranking of these schools also appears in Table 2.7. In general, schools ranked by primary, special and pre-school teachers fell into fairly distinct and expected groups: coastal areas were most preferred, then inland areas, followed by smaller, more remote areas. The pattern for secondary schools was quite similar. These results demonstrate the difficulties of staffing all schools with volunteers and confirm the need for either compulsion or increased incentives to staff the more unfavoured schools.

It is clear that teachers are quite definite in their preferences for schools. Just what factors are important in influencing a person's choice of a place to teach? Table 3 gives the teachers' answers to this question.

TABLE 3: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS INFLUENCING TRANSFER

	Factors	Percentage of Respondents				
		Very Important (4)	Quite Important (3)	Slightly Important (2)	Not Important (1)	Mean Rating
1.	Secondary schooling for children [1]	73.0	12.3	7.5	7.2	3.51
2.	Employment, tertiary education for children [1]	58.5	19.7	12.9	8.9	3.28
3.	Cost of living	40.3	36.0	1.65	7.2	3.09
4.	Employment for spouse [2]	58.6	8.9	12.0	20.5	3.05
5.	Cultural, professional facilities	22.8	41.6	28.0	7.6	2.79
6.	Proximity to friends, family	26.4	30.0	28.1	15.4	2.68
7.	Locality allowance	28.2	27.1	24.1	20.6	2.63
8.	General recreational facilities	12.0	43.9	34.0	10.1	2.58
9.	Climate	14.7	39.7	34.0	17.0	2.41
10.	Socio-economic character of locality	9.9	39.1	34.0	17.0	2.41
11.	Sporting facilities	7.1	26.2	32.2	34.5	2.06
12.	Church facilities	6.2	13.2	28.8	51.7	1.74

[1] Percentages based only on respondents with children

[2] Percentages based only on married respondents

It can be seen from Table 3 that the factors which teachers considered very important in determining where they would prefer to teach virtually divided into two clusters: those of an economic nature and those pertaining to family issues. Such factors as *climate, proximity to church, sporting facilities, the socio-economic character of the district* and *proximity to general recreational facilities* were not considered, for

the most part, to be of great importance.

For a teacher to be transferred to a small district where secondary schooling was not readily available for his children would mean considerable expense (despite Departmental allowances) and family disruption. It is thus understandable that, as Table 3 reveals, the two most important factors influencing transfer concern the future of teachers' children. The *availability of secondary schooling* was more important for married teachers and for teachers with families. Teachers aged 26 to 45 years, those most likely to have children of secondary school age, felt more concerned about their children's secondary education than did teachers under 26 years or teachers over 46 years (Table 2.8). The teacher's age, marital status, and parental status influenced in a similar way the importance he attached to the *availability of employment or tertiary education for children* (Tables 2.9 and 2.10). Concern for his children's future, then, increased with the teacher's age to 45 years and was, naturally, greater for married teachers with families. The limited opportunties for employment in rural areas and the costs incurred in sending children away to tertiary institutions appear to present special problems for the kind of experienced teacher that the Queensland Teachers Union hopes would be attracted to country areas.

Cost of living and *availability of employment for spouse* emerged as the next most important influences. Males indicated more concern for the cost of living than did female teachers while teachers whose spouses were unemployed rated cost of living a more important influence than did teachers with working spouses (Table 2.11). Table 2.11 further shows that teachers in coastal areas gave more importance to *cost of living* than did teachers in country areas, thus giving weight to the claim that the high cost of living in rural areas acts as a real deterrent to coastal teachers in seeking country appointments.

Varied concern was shown for the problem of gaining employment (if desired) for a spouse should the teacher in the family be transferred. Predictably this was of greater importance to married teachers than single teachers (Table 2.12), but there were significant differences on the importance of this factor with respect to the teacher's sex, age and position in school (Table 2.13). Importance of spouse employment was greater for females than for males, reflecting the concern of married women for teaching in locations near their husband's employment. As the teacher's age increased, so the importance of this factor declined. This is hardly surprising considering the imposing economic strains facing young married couples today. Moreover, the trend was for staff teachers rather than those in promotional positions (on higher salaries) to rate the opportunity of employment for spouse as very important.

There were significant differences, too, among the respondents on the importance given to the factor *proximity to cultural and professional facilities* (Table 2.14). Females rated this of more importance than did male teachers, while younger teachers (under 26) stressed it more than did older teachers. There was a tendency for principals to be less concerned than were other staff members, and for teachers in coastal areas to rate this factor as more important than did those in country areas.

Considering the extent to which other economic factors were given importance, the *locality allowance* does not appear as a particularly significant influence on a teacher's choice of a place to teach. Males gave greater emphasis to this factor than did females (Table 2.15) which was consistent with the findings for *cost of living* reported earlier in this chapter. It will be remembered that increases in the locality allowances were made

after this survey had been conducted, so the previous allowances, considered by many to be grossly inadequate, could have exerted a negative influence upon the views of the teachers. Apparently at the time of the survey the teachers thought that the locality allowance was almost too low to count.

Table 2.16 compares the views of Queensland and South Australian teachers on the factors influencing their preferences for transfer. Results of chi-square tests indicated that there were no significant d erences between the two states for *climate, socio-economic character of the district, proximity to professional and recreational facilities* and *proximity to friends or family.* Queensland teachers placed significantly greater importance upon largely economic factors such as *cost of living, locality allowance, employment for children, secondary schooling for children,* and *employment for spouse.*

Some comments are necessary lest it be thought that Queensland teachers are a particularly mercenary group. The South Australian survey was conducted in 1973. Since then, the rate of inflation has accelerated and increases in the cost of living and housing have emerged as crucial issues to the country teacher. South Australian teachers in 1973 would not have felt at that time the full impact of the inflationary spiral, and this, together with the policy of price control on land in South Australia, may partially explain the difference in attitudes.

Differences in the geographical size of the two states must also be taken into consideration. Compared to South Australia, there are in Queensland a significantly larger proportion of children in areas which could be regarded as remote (Schools Commission, 1975). If this greater remoteness is associated with higher costs of living due to transport costs, then the concern of Queensland teachers for economic factors is placed in better perspective.

Relationships Between Factors Influencing Transfer and Teachers' Preferences

To examine further which factors were important in influencing teachers' choices of school locations, relationships between these factors and the teachers' preferences for their next transfer were computed. This analysis is based on the proposition that if the factors that teachers believe influence their choice of a place to teach really are influential, the factors should correlate with expressed preferences for school location. If a factor correlates with an expressed preference for a town, then it might be inferred that this factor does indeed influence teachers' choice of that town. However, if a factor does not correlate, then teachers are mistaken in their belief that the factor is important in influencing their choice of town.

Because secondary teachers ranked different schools from primary, pre-school and special teachers, two tables of correlations have been presented (Tables 2.17 and 2.18).

From Table 2.17, it can be seen that, for primary, special and pre-school teachers, five factors correlated significantly with expressed preference for Toowoomba and two for Thursday Island. The positive correlations for Toowoomba show that teachers who showed high preference for this city also tended to rate each of the following five factors of great importance: *secondary schooling for children, employment and tertiary education for children, cost of living, cultural and professional facilities,* and

proximity to friends and family. In other words, it is these perceived features of Toowoomba that attract teachers' preferences for Toowoomba as a place to teach. Conversely, the negative correlations for Thursday Island show that teachers who ranked Thursday Island low on their list of preferences gave great weight to *proximity to friends and family* and *cost of living* as factors influencing transfer. That is, teachers who particularly like to live near their friends and family and who especially want to avoid areas with a high cost of living, tend to rate Thursday Island as very low on their list of preferred locations.

The more towns a factor correlates with, the more influential that factor can be said to be in determining preference for school location. Thus it would appear from Tables 2.17 and 2.18 that economic factors have been less influential in the teachers' ranking of the ten towns than might have been suggested from the results in Table 3. For instance, two factors viewed by teachers as highly important in influencing transfers *cost of living* and *spouse employment*, correlated significantly with very few towns. On the other hand, *proximity to friends and family* and *cultural and professional facilities* correlated with a number of towns: teachers who valued proximity to friends or family and the availability of professional and cultural facilities, tended to rank areas such as Toowoomba, Woodridge, and Miami highly, and towns such as Blackwater, Thursday Island, Mt. Isa and Goondiwindi lowly. Thus, when an *actual* choice of towns had to be made, factors of a personal and family nature emerged as more important than economic considerations.

The fact that so many expected relationships were not significant raises some interesting questions. It may well be that there was considerable variability in the teachers' impressions of these towns with respect to services, facilities and so on, and this might have caused the lack of expected results. If teachers' knowledge of the prevailing conditions is meagre, some dissemination of the relevant information will be necessary so that teachers who may desire transfers away from home areas can make rational decisions. A directory of Queensland state schools, recently compiled by the Joint Committee investigating the transfer system, contains a good deal of relevant information and may be of some such assistance to teachers in determining preferences for transfer.

It should be remembered that the list of schools and the list of factors influencing transfer were short: other factors might be of major importance in determining preferences for school location, and a longer list of schools would have given better estimates of the factors of importance in choice of school location. More research would be needed to precisely delineate the real factors underlying choice of school location.

Incentives

From the preference ranking of schools and the list of factors influencing transfer it is evident that many teachers regard whole areas of Queensland as perhaps places to visit, but not to stay and teach. Should there then be some compensation for teaching in such areas? An overwhelming proportion of teachers (97.4 percent) thought that there should indeed be some compensation offered to teachers for benefits foregone in working in remote areas. Over 83 percent agreed that teachers already living in remote areas should receive the same benefits as teachers from favoured areas on their transfer there. The general form that this compensation should take, beyond the present allowances

and concessions, was clearly economic. A large majority of teachers (89.3 percent) favoured money or money substitutes. Teachers were also asked their opinion of a points system and whether such a system should refer to accelerated promotion or preference in promotion. The points system was favoured by 64.4 percent of the teachers.

The teacher in the smaller inland areas rather than those from the larger coastal districts gave most support to a points system (Table 2.19). One interesting result was that there were no significant differences in teachers' responses with respect to *position in school.* This result thus goes against the expectation that, since teachers in classified positions could have expected greater benefits from a points system than could those in classroom situations, teachers at the principal, deputy and subject master levels would favour such a system to a greater extent than would the classroom teacher.

Of the teachers who did favour a points system, a large majority (85.5 percent) thought that it should refer to preference in promotion or selection, all other factors (e.g. seniority, experience, efficiency) being equal. Teachers were more cautious when consideration was given as to whether a points system should be used to accelerate promotion. Only 36.6 percent were of the opinion that this should be the case. It is clear from these results that teachers thought preference in promotion would give only a very slight advantage to colleagues who might work in the remote areas, whereas accelerated promotion would give a significant advantage.

There are many other possible incentives beyond money and a points system. Teachers were presented with a list of eleven such incentives and asked to indicate on a four-point scale the extent to which the incentives would be important in influencing them to accept an appointment to a location they regarded as undesirable. Examination of the incentives preferred by teachers might provide some guidelines for the construction of an incentive based transfer scheme that relies as far as possible on teachers volunteering to serve in unpleasant locations. Table 4 shows the teachers' opinions about the various incentives that could be offered in such a scheme.

TABLE 4: TEACHERS' RATINGS OF INCENTIVES TO TEACH IN UNDESIRABLE LOCATIONS

Incentives	Percentage of Respondents				Mean Rating
	Powerful Incentive (4)	Fairly Strong Incentive (3)	Slight Influence (2)	No Influence (1)	
1. Salary loading	55.9	30.7	10.7	2.7	3.39
2. Quality, low rent house or flat	53.9	32.7	10.7	2.6	3.37
3. Extra long service after three years	42.9	34.5	16.2	6.4	3.15
4. Annual concession for travel to home centre	44.9	30.1	18.9	6.1	3.14
5. Concession for family education[1]	43.1	30.2	19.9	6.8	3.10
6. Low interest government loan	38.3	28.1	20.9	12.7	2.92
7. Excellent school buildings and facilities	24.0	49.0	19.7	7.3	2.90
8. Financial aid for medical, dental treatment	30.1	33.2	26.6	10.1	2.83
9. Regional centre for professional facilities	20.2	39.9	30.2	9.7	2.70
10. Accelerated promotion	22.3	30.4	27.5	19.9	2.55
11. Points system	15.6	34.3	30.6	19.5	2.46

[1] Based upon married respondents with children.

The group of incentives considered to be most influential centred on money and housing.

The most important incentive to teachers in general was a salary loading: some 55.9 percent of teachers thought that this was a powerful incentive. Responses to this incentive varied with the teacher's age and location of school (Table 2.20). As the age of the teacher increased, there was a corresponding decrease in the rated influence of *salary loading.* For teachers over the age of 35, a substantial minority indicated little interest in monetary gains. Teachers in the larger towns placed considerably more emphasis on *salary loading* than did those in smaller districts. Age of teacher and location of school interact, so that for teachers in the 26–35 year age group presently teaching in a large town, a salary loading would be a particularly powerful incentive (Table 2.21). Of course it was beyond the scope of the survey to determine of what order such a salary loading should be to produce an effect. For teachers in the large centres, it would seem that the salary loading or locality allowances at the time of the survey were regarded neither as an incentive nor as adequate compensation.

Quality low rent house or flat was regarded as a powerful incentive by 53.9 percent of teachers: a degree of support almost as strong as that for a salary loading. The problem of housing in rural areas has been discussed in the introduction to this report, and it is not surprising that teachers both married and single, found low rent housing to be a powerful incentive. It may well be, however, that provision of better housing would remove a serious deterrent rather than provide a definite incentive since, in general, the standard and the availability of housing in inland areas appears to fall short of that in coastal regions.

Overall, *extra long service after three years* was seen as the third most powerful incentive by teachers. Female teachers rated this a more attractive incentive than did males, while married teachers reacted more favourably than did single teachers (Table 2.22). There were no significant differences due to the teacher's age or professional status. It would appear, then, that additional long service leave for teachers after three years in a remote area has considerable appeal to a wide section of the teaching force.

Almost 45 percent of teachers were strongly motivated by *travel concessions to home centres.* This incentive attracted more single teachers than married, while there were also significant differences among teachers according to *location of school* (Table 2.23). In general, teachers from the large coastal areas and the smallest rural districts found this incentive most appealing.

A concession for family education figured prominently in the list of incentives. Because this item did not apply equally to all teachers, the responses reported in Table 4 were based only on data from married teachers with children. Single teachers and teachers without children were predictably less enthusiastic about family education concessions than were married teachers with children (Table 2.24).

A *low interest government loan* was found to be a powerful incentive by 38.3 percent of the teachers, and married teachers found such a loan more attractive than did single teachers (Table 2.25).

Table 4 reveals that, in the eyes of the teachers, *excellent school buildings and facilities,* and *financial aid for medical and dental treatment* were the seventh and eighth most important incentives in the list of eleven incentives. Opinions on these incentives were not significantly different across teacher groups.

Preference for the economic and family incentives is further illustrated by the low rating given to what might be termed "career" variables: *professional facilities, accelerated promotion,* and *a points system.* There were substantial proportions of teachers for whom these incentives had little or no effect. However, some interesting variations among the subsamples of respondents were apparent.

Table 4 indicates that only 20.2 percent of the sample of teachers thought that *professional facilities* would be a powerful incentive. As Table 2.26 shows, female teachers responded more favourably to this incentive than did male teachers. Also, less emphasis was given to this incentive by older teachers. Thus, if these ratings are a reliable guide, establishing regional centres and providing in-service facilities is not likely to effectively attract older, more experienced teachers to the more remote areas of the state.

Accelerated promotion was seen as a powerful incentive by only 22.3 percent of the teachers. Reactions to *accelerated promotion* were uniform across all groups with one predictable exception: male teachers, typically more career oriented, found this to be a greater incentive than did female teachers (Table 2.27). It would appear that, within the present promotion structures in the primary and secondary school systems neither age nor position in school is an influential variable in determining teachers' attitudes to accelerated promotion as an incentive.

That little support for a points system was given is hardly surprising in the light of reactions to the incentive of accelerated promotion. For half of the teachers, such a system provided little or no incentive: only 15.6 percent regarded a points system as a poweful incentive. However, it did prove to be more attractive to principals and subject masters than to classroom teachers (Table 2.28). Again, this possibly reflects the nature of the promotion system. Teachers may have been unsure of just what comprised a points system. If the belief of the Joint Committee that a points system should be associated with money incentives had been made more explicit on the questionnaire, this incentive may have drawn a more favourable response.

A comparison between the responses made by the Queensland teachers on incentives and those of the South Australian teachers is shown in Table 2.29. Queensland teachers placed significantly greater emphasis upon such incentives as *salary loading, low rent house or flat, extra long service leave* and *a low interest government loan.*

Since Queensland teachers showed more concern than did South Australian teachers for monetary issues as a factor influencing their choice of a place to teach, it is not surprising that they placed more emphasis on the monetary incentives. It is interesting to note that the relatively minor importance accorded to *professional facilities* and *accelerated promotion* as incentives was not confined to Queensland teachers: there were no significant differences on the importance of the two factors between the two states.

Compulsion in Transfer

The teachers' support for various forms of incentives, discussed above, provides guidelines for widening the system of incentives in a teacher transfer scheme. However, if incentives prove to be inadequate to staff all schools under a voluntary transfer system, a scheme with some elements of compulsion would be necessary in order to provide equal educational opportunity for all children in the state.

If transfer is at least partly compulsory, what factors should exempt teachers from service in remote areas? The opinions of the sample of teachers on this question are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: TEACHERS' OPINIONS ON POSSIBLE EXEMPTIONS FROM SERVICE IN REMOTE AREAS

Possible Exemption	Percentage in favour	Percentage not in favour
Ill health requiring specialist attention	98.7	1.3
Sole support of widowed or invalid parent	89.5	10.5
University studies (special courses)	80.8	19.2
Educational needs of teacher's children	77.3	22.7
Marriage (females)	70.0	30.0
Marriage (males)	29.9	70.1
Possession of property	28.8	71.2
Sporting ability and affiliation	20.2	79.8
Interest in a business	18.2	81.8
Preference for large city location	17.5	82.5

Note. – For each possible exemption, teachers' opinions were significantly different from a neutral stance of 50 percent in favour and 50 percent opposed.

It can be seen from Table 5 that factors which teachers felt should exempt a teacher from transfer to remote locations were fairly predictable. Those which might be described as family issues dominated this group.

Teachers were virtually unanimous in believing that ill-health should exempt a teacher from service in remote areas. In view of the difficulty that many inland districts experience in attracting medical specialists, and the distances from medical centres in remote areas, this is hardly surprising. Teachers who support parents were also perceived by a large majority to deserve exemption from service in remote areas. As with the first factor, there were no significant differences in the responses of the various subgroups of teachers to this item.

The third factor, special university courses, displayed some variability according to the sex, age and spouse of the teacher (Table 2.30), although a large majority of the total sample of teachers felt that such courses warranted exemption of the teacher from transfer to remote areas. Female teachers placed greater emphasis upon university courses as reasons for exemption than did male teachers. Of the five age groups, it was the under 26 group of teachers and the 46–55 group who gave most support for this factor as an exemption. When age was controlled, there were significant differences for

the youngest teacher groups according to *location of school* (Table 2.31): young teachers outside of Brisbane, with access to external studies only (except for Townsville teachers), gave more recognition to this factor than did the Brisbane teachers. These findings are consistent with the fact that the range of correspondence courses offered by the Department of External Studies at the University of Queensland is more limited than those in the corresponding internal departments, particularly in those subjects where practical work is an integral part of the course.

A total of 77.3 percent of teachers thought that *educational needs of teacher's children* should be a sufficient reason for exemption from service in remote areas. There were significant differences among the teachers with respect to age, sex, marital status and number of children in the family on this factor (Table 2.32). Male teachers rated the factor as being more important than did female teachers and, not unexpectedly, married teachers and those with children showed more concern than did those who were not married or who had no children in the family. There was a tendency for the emphasis given to this factor to increase as the teacher's age increased. It was thus the group of experienced teachers who felt most strongly that the educational needs of teachers' children should exempt teachers from transfer. It is also just such teachers that the Queensland Teachers Union hopes will be attracted to rural areas to provide some stability and experience on school staffs.

Marriage of female teachers was the final factor which teachers considered to be worthy of warranting exemption of the teacher from country services. From Table 2.33 it can be seen that while 80.4 percent of female teachers thought that this should be so, only 56.7 percent of male teachers were of the same opinion. Clearly a significant proportion of male teachers resent this exemption which so discriminates against them. Moreover, as Table 2.33 reveals, the support for marriage of female teachers as an exemption decreased as the respondent's age increased so that 47.5 percent of the oldest teacher group believed that married females should not be exempted from transfer to remote areas. The extent of these differences is surprising: it is hardly conceivable that, in the present Australian society, wide support would be given to the proposition that a female teacher with a husband of a different occupation should be subject to transfer to a rural location. Table 233 shows that of the teachers whose spouses were employed other than in teaching, 85.2 percent thought that the marriage of females should be sufficient reason for exemption from transfer. However, a substantial minority of other groups of teachers thought otherwise.

From Table 5 the factors which teachers believe should not exempt a teacher from transfer to remote areas can be grouped broadly into three areas:

(i) marriage of males;
(ii) commercial interests;
(iii) recreational interests.

In general, the marriage of male teachers was not considered worthy of exemption. However, this was not uniform for all subgroups of teachers as Table 2.34 shows. Teachers without children were more inclined to think that this factor should lead to exemption, and the age of the teacher emerged as another important variable. While 43.7 percent of teachers under 26 years of age were of the opinion that the marriage of males should be sufficient for exemption, the percentage was much lower for older respondents. The group of experienced teachers, then, did not believe that marriage by male teachers should be sufficient grounds for exemption.

Overall, least support was given to *preference for large city location* as an exempting factor. The importance of this factor declined with increasing age of the teacher, while single teachers considered it of more importance than did married teachers (Table 2.35).

CONCLUSIONS

A voluntary system of transfer, whereby a teacher would be transferred between schools only at his request, is an ideal arrangement in the eyes of the vast majority of teachers. Such a system is closely akin to the teacher recruitment systems of Great Britain, Canada and the United States of America.

A smaller majority of teachers found acceptable a system with some elements of compulsion. Over two-thirds endorsed a plan of compulsory transfer if, and only if, no applicants were attracted to a vacant position. This plan implies some means by which teacher preferences for transfer may be expressed, and an incentive scheme for attracting teachers to the more unpopular areas of the state. Such a system may have received majority support because it would staff all schools, provide incentives for volunteers to serve in the more undesirable locations, and ensure that those most opposed to transfer to remote areas would be least likely to be transferred there.

An entirely obligatory system of transfer received less support from teachers: only 45 percent of the sample found such a system acceptable. In all systems of teacher transfer, teachers felt that if transferring a teacher to a remote location would cause significant hardship, then that teacher should be exempt from the transfer. Ill-health, support of parent, children's education, and marriage of females emerged as factors which teachers thought should exempt teachers from service in these localities. Other possible exemptions —business interests, marriage of males, possession of property, and the like—received scant support.

Before the implications of teachers' ratings of various incentives are discussed, it should be stressed that the perceived importance of the incentives in no way implies causation. Despite assertions by some teachers than an incentive system will reduce teacher turnover and increase the proportion of experienced teachers in rural areas, it is beyond the scope of this study to confirm or refute these beliefs. There is no evidence in this research on whether or not the implementation of an incentive system based upon teachers' preferences would result in an increase in the number of mature and experienced teachers on country school staffs; nor can it be said that the duration of remote area service would increase significantly beyond the present expected period.

Bearing in mind this limitation to inference, the teachers' attitudes to various incentives implies that incentives of two types would prove most acceptable to teachers:

(i) economic bonuses; and
(ii) family concessions.

The most important incentives, as expected, centred around salary loadings and the availability of quality housing at reasonable rentals. Although the magnitude of such a salary loading cannot be determined from this study, it can be inferred that quite a considerable amount would be required to attract volunteers in view of the relatively

small effect the present locality allowances had on the teachers' preferences for school location. Since the present locality allowances often do not even compensate for the cost of living disparities between coastal regions and rural districts, the need for further discrimination in favour of country teachers is plain. When one considers the additional costs facing rural teachers – costs for food and housing, for services, for travel to home areas on vacation, and for car maintenance – it is reasonable that extra allowances are perceived by teachers as necessary if they are to be attracted to unfavoured areas.

If it is accepted that rural students suffer educational disadvantages due, in part, to a lower proportion of experienced teachers in their schools, then any incentive system should be designed to attract experienced teachers in particular. Data from this study have shown that, for increases in teacher age beyond 35 years, a salary loading loses impact as an incentive. For teachers aged 26–35 years, especially those in Brisbane and large coastal towns, strong support was given to loadings on salary as an incentive. Such a group of teachers combines youth with some years of experience, the very combination which, it is claimed, is lacking on country school staffs.

In view of the solid support for other incentives – extra long service leave, travel concessions, concessions for family education, and low interest government loans – it becomes apparent that advantages other than that of a salary increment, would have to be worked out: additional salary seems to be a necessary, though not sufficient, incentive in the eyes of the teachers.

Hardly less important as an incentive was the availability of good, cheap accommodation. Presumably, both single and married teachers still perceive problems of accommodation to exist in rural areas. Undoubtedly, the extent of the problem varies between districts, but while this general impression remains, any amelioration of the housing problem by the Department of Education is unlikely to achieve much in removing this serious deterrent, unless the changes are widely publicised.

Principals, in applying for positions, know whether or not Departmental accommodation is available by means of the school preference lists. The teachers, by contrast, have not been so fortunate and the *Directory of Queensland State Schools* recently compiled by the Joint Committee is an attempt, *inter alia*, to rectify this situation so that teachers who wish to apply for transfers can make their choices on the basis of recent information about the school and its environment. Another possible source of information on accommodation has been suggested by the Queensland Teachers Union: a specialist Welfare Officer appointed to collect and disseminate accommodation information to prospective teacher applicants.

The second type of incentives clustered around family concessions. Foremost were concessions for family education which reflected the teachers' concern for the availability of secondary education for children. Teachers with families approaching high school age face the possibility of considerable expense and family disruption if secondary education is unavailable in their district. Such teachers gave particular emphasis to the incentive value of extending educational concessions beyond those now in operation.

Proximity to friends and family emerged as a more subtle factor in influencing teachers' preferences for transfer locality. It was not surprising, then, that teachers were strongly attracted to additional travel concessions to home areas.

Although incentives of a more professional character appeared to be less strong than those concerning economic and family issues, the improvement of working conditions in rural areas cannot be overlooked in any incentive scheme. A school's proximity to cultural and professional facilities seemed to exert a strong influence upon teachers' preferences for transfer locality. Of course, it is not possible to gauge what proportion of this influence was due solely to professional facilities. However, the professional isolation of rural teachers is by no means mythical. In contrast to teachers in coastal districts, those in remote areas are likely to find access to Teachers' Centres particularly difficult. Furthermore, visits by advisory teachers also tend to be less frequent in the remote north west and central regions of Queensland (Varley & Cummings, 1976).

As an appendix to this discussion on incentives, it should be noted that, at least according to one group of theorists (Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman, 1959), the listed incentives are those which, if implemented, are likely to reduce teacher dissatisfaction but not to increase teacher satisfaction. Whatever the truth of the theory, it cannot be assumed that implementation of any of the incentives considered here will inevitably increase teacher satisfaction. However, perceptions of the perceived importance of incentives do provide a reasonable guide to the acceptability of the various alternatives.

REFERENCES

Campbell, W.J. & associates. *Being a teacher in Australian state schools, AACRDE Report No. 5.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1975.

Charters, W.W. The social background of teaching. In N.L. Gage (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Coverdale, G.M. Some determinants of teacher morale in state schools in New South Wales. *Forum of Education,* 1973, 32 (1), 43–50.

Griffiths, D.E., Goldman, S., & McFarland, W.J. Teacher mobility in New York City. *Education of Administration Quarterly,* 1965, 1(1), 15–31.

Havighurst, R.J., & Neugarten, B.L. *Society and education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1957.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B.B. *The motivation to work.* N.Y.: Wiley, 1959.

Pedersen, K.G. Teacher migration and attrition. *Administrator's Notebook,* 1970, 18(8).

Queensland Teachers Union. Conditions for learning and teaching in country areas of Queensland. *Queensland Teachers Journal,* 1974, 79(6), 1–5.

Schools Commission. *Report for the triennium 1976–1978.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, 1975.

Varley, P.J., & Cummings, J. *The advisory teacher service in Queensland primary schools.* Brisbane: Department of Education, Queensland, 1976.

Walberg, H.J. (Ed.) *Evaluating educational performance.* Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.

APPENDIX 1

TRANSFER SCHEME SURVEY

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Put a tick in the appropriate box of the category which applies to you.

SEX

- Male
- Female

AGE

- under 26 years
- 26–35
- 36–45
- 46–55
- 56–65

MARITAL STATUS

- Single
- Married
- Widowed
- Separated/ Divorced

FAMILY

- Children at home
- No children at home

SPOUSE INFORMATION

- Spouse is a practising teacher
- Spouse is employed other than teaching
- Spouse is unemployed

TEACHING SITUATION

- pre-school
- primary school
- secondary school
- secondary department
- special school

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOL (School Size)

Primary, Special

- Class 1
- Class 2
- Class 3
- Class 4
- Class 5
- Class 6

Secondary

- Grade 1
- Grade 2

Pre-School

- Single Unit 1
- Double Unit 2
- Triple Unit 3

POSITION

- Principal
- Deputy Principal or Senior Mistress
- Subject Master or *Infant* Mistress
- Class Teacher
- Other Positions

LOCATION OF SCHOOL

- Brisbane
- Coastal Town (pop. 20,000+)
- Coastal Town (under 20,000)
- Inland Town (3,000+)
- Inland Town (under 3,000)
- Small rural district

SPECIALITY

If working in the Secondary field, main speciality is:

- Humanities
- Maths–Science
- Physical Education
- Art
- Commerce
- Home Economics
- Manual Training

2. Should schools in areas regarded as remote (i.e. beyond daily contact with provincial cities) be staffed by compulsory transfer of teachers when no teacher applies for appointment to the school? Yes No

3. Which of the following factors should exempt a teacher from service in remote areas?

(i)	Marriage (female teachers)	Yes	No
(ii)	Marriage (young males teachers)	Yes	No
(iii)	Education needs of teacher's children	Yes	No
(iv)	Sole support of widowed or invalid parent	Yes	No
(v)	Possession of property	Yes	No
(vi)	Ill health requiring specialist attention	Yes	No
(vii)	Preference for large city location	Yes	No
(viii)	Sporting ability or affiliation	Yes	No
(ix)	Interest in a business	Yes	No
(x)	University studies (special courses)	Yes	No

Comment: (add any additional factor)

4. Do you consider that there should be compensation for benefits foregone in serving in remote areas? Yes No

5. If you consider compensation desirable, what form should it take *beyond the present forms?* (i.e. beyond tax deductions in some areas; guaranteed transfer to home areas after specified periods; remote area allowances as at present; transport to rail-head at Midsummer Vacations in some cases.)

(i) A point system offering benefits for remote service Yes No

(ii) Money or money substitutes Yes No

6. If you said YES to (i) above, should this refer to:

(i) Accelerated promotion Yes No

(ii) Preference in promotion or selection when all other factors are equal Yes No

7. If adequate incentives, as might be agreed upon by the Department of Education and the Queensland Teachers Union, are offered, should transfer then be

(i) *obligatory*, having regard for genuine compassionate factors (as in question 3 (iv) Yes No

(ii) by *application* Yes No

8. If a voluntary system, based on incentives were instituted, would you consider that a position which failed to attract a volunteer should be filled on an obligatory basis by the direction there of a teacher? Yes No

9. Should teachers already living in remote areas as their home areas receive the same incentive benefits as teachers from favoured areas on transfer there?

10. If any of the answers in the following columns is *less* than 10, show with a preceding zero, e.g. 07, 05, 00.

Indicate in Column 1 the *total* period, in whole years, you taught in *each* area.
Indicate in Column 2 the longest *continuous* span of whole years you taught in each area.

	Column 1 Total Period	Column 2 Longest Continuous Span in Whole Years
Brisbane		
Coastal Town (pop. 20,000+)		
Coastal Town (under 20,000)		
Inland Town (pop. 3000+)		
Inland Town (under 3000)		
Small Rural District		

11. Imagine you are given a choice between schools in the places listed below for your next transfer. Number them 1 to 10 in order of preference, number 1 being the place in which you would *most* like to teach, and number 10 being the place in which you would *least* like to teach.

Grade this column if you are a Pre-School, Primary or Special school teacher.

. Toowoomba
. Mount Isa
. Woodridge
. Ingham
. Gladstone
. Maryborough
. Mount Garnett
. Emerald
. Thargomindah
. Thursday Island

Grade this column if you are a Secondary teacher.

. Toowoomba
. Mount Isa
. Woodridge
. Ingham
. Gladstone
. Maryborough
. Blackwater
. Goondiwindi
. Miami
. Thursday Island

12. Listed below are some of the factors which may influence your choice of a place to teach. Indicate the extent to which each factor is important to you by circling the appropriate number.

1 = this factor is of overwhelming importance
2 = this factor is quite important
3 = this factor has only a slight influence
4 = this factor does not figure in your thinking at all

	Very important	Quite important	Slightly important	Not important
. Climate	1	2	3	4
. Socio-economic character of locality	1	2	3	4
. Proximity to cultural and professional facilities	1	2	3	4
. Local availability of specific church facilities	1	2	3	4
. Local availability of specific sporting facilities	1	2	3	4
. Proximity to general recreational facilities	1	2	3	4
. Proximity to friends and/or family	1	2	3	4
. Availability of employment for spouse	1	2	3	4
. Availability of Secondary schooling for children	1	2	3	4
. Availability of employment and/or tertiary education for children	1	2	3	4
. Locality allowance	1	2	3	4
. Cost of living	1	2	3	4

Please add any additional factors affecting your choice _____

13. Listed below are some incentives which could make teaching in unpopular locations more attractive. Circle the appropriate number for each condition or benefit according to the influence it would have in motivating you to accept appointment to a place you rated, 7,8,9 or 10 in Question 11.

1 = this would be a powerful incentive
2 = this would be a fairly strong incentive
3 = this would have only a slight influence
4 = this would have no influence on you

	Powerful incentive	Fairly strong incentive	Slight influence	No influence
. Excellent school buildings and facilities	1	2	3	4
. Accelerated promotion	1	2	3	4
. A salary loading	1	2	3	4
. Quality, low rent house or flat	1	2	3	4
. Eligibility for low interest Government loan for any purpose after (say) 3 years' service there	1	2	3	4
. Extra long service leave after 3 years	1	2	3	4
. Regional centre nearby, providing library, study, and in-service facilities to teachers	1	2	3	4
. Financial aid for Specialist Medical or Dental treatment	1	2	3	4
. Concession for family education	1	2	3	4
. Annual concession for travel to nominated home centre	1	2	3	4
. A points system	1	2	3	4

Please add any additional incentives which could influence you _____ . . .

PLEASE CHECK TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL ITEMS
THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION

APPENDIX 2

TABLE 2.1: LOCALITY ALLOWANCES FOR MARRIED MALE OFFICERS

Location	Locality Allowance Per Fortnight	
	Before 1 October 1975	After 1 October 1975
Toowoomba	Nil	Nil
Rockhampton	$ 3.00	$ 4.00
Goondiwindi	$ 3.00	$ 4.00
Roma	$ 6.00	$ 8.00
Charters Towers	$ 8.00	$10.50
Innisfail	$ 9.50	$12.50
Emerald	$11.50	$15.50
Cloncurry	$18.50	$24.50
Mount Isa	$26.50	$35.00
Thursday Island	$29.00	$38.00

TABLE 2.2: REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SAMPLE, BY SEX AND TYPE OF SCHOOL OF TEACHERS

		Percentages		x^2
		Sample	Population	
SEX	Males	44.7	43.4	$x^2 = 0.54$;
	Females	55.3	56.6	d.f. = 1;
				$p > .25$
TYPE OF SCHOOL	Pre-school	1.00	1.65	$x^2 = 7.06$;
	Primary	58.30	54.75	d.f. = 3;
	Secondary	38.20	39.19	$p > .05$
	Secondary Department			
	Special	2.50	4.42	

TABLE 2.3: CHARACTERISTICS OF WEIGHTED SAMPLE BY MARITAL STATUS, SPOUSE INFORMATION, FAMILY, AGE AND LOCATION OF SCHOOL OF TEACHER

	Marital Status				Spouse Information			Family	
	Single	Married	Widowed	Separated	Spouse a Teacher	Spouse Employed Elsewhere	Spouse Unemployed	Children	No Children
Total Weighted Percentage	29.2	65.6	1.6	3.6	27.4	44.5	28.1	47.6	52.4

	Age						Location of School					
	under 26	26–35	36–45	46–55	56–65		Brisbane	Large Coastal Town	Small Coastal Town	Large Inland Town	Small Inland Town	Small Rural District
Total Weighted Percentage	40.0	36.1	13.4	6.5	4.0		32.2	18.5	12.1	16.8	8.6	11.9

TABLE 2.4: ATTITUDES TO OBLIGATORY SYSTEM OF TRANSFER BY AGE AND SCHOOL STATUS OF TEACHER

Teacher Variable		Attitude to Obligatory Transfer		Weighted N
		In Favour %	Not in Favour %	
Age [a]	Under 26	43.7	56.3	336
	26–35	41.9	58.1	307
	36–45	50.5	49.5	111
	46–55	43.8	56.2	56
	56–65	75.1	24.9	32
School Status [b]	Principal	58.2	41.8	81
	Deputy, Senior Mistress	72.2	27.8	34
	Subject Master, Infant Mistress	47.4	52.8	35
	Teacher	41.7	58.3	651
	Others	45.3	54.7	41

[a] $\chi^2 = 14.54$; d.f. = 4; $p < .01$

[b] $\chi^2 = 18.68$; d.f. = 4; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.5: ATTITUDES TO OBLIGATORY SYSTEM OF TRANSFER, BY MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER

Marital Status	Attitude to Obligatory System		Weighted N
	In Favour %	Not in Favour %	
Single	60.9	39.1	256
Married	72.2	27.8	590
Widowed	50.5	49.5	15
Separated	64.8	35.2	33

$\chi^2 = 12.85$; d.f. = 3; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.6: ATTITUDES TO VOLUNTARY SYSTEM OF TRANSFER, BY AGE AND SCHOOL STATUS OF TEACHER

Teacher Variable		Attitude to voluntary system		Weighted N
		In Favour %	Not in Favour %	
Age [a]	Under 26	95.2	4.8	350
	26–35	92.2	7.8	314
	36–45	90.2	9.8	109
	46–55	84.4	15.6	52
	56–65	67.0	33.0	36
School Status [b]	Principal	77.7	22.3	74
	Deputy, Senior Mistress	77.8	22.2	34
	Subject Master, Infant Mistress	81.0	19.0	39
	Teacher	94.8	5.2	669
	Others	87.6	12.4	45

[a] $\chi^2 = 38.06$; d.f. = 4; $p < .001$

[b] $\chi^2 = 42.69$; d.f. = 4; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.7: TEACHERS' PREFERENCES FOR NEXT TRANSFER – MEAN RANKINGS OF AREAS AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL FIRST PREFERENCES

PRIMARY, SPECIAL AND PRE-SCHOOL TEACHERS			SECONDARY TEACHERS		
School	Mean Ranking [1]	Percent of teachers giving first preference	School	Mean Ranking [1]	Percent of teachers giving first preference
1. Toowoomba	2.41	43.6	1. Toowoomba	2.67	34.4
2. Maryborough	2.66	21.3	2. Maryborough	3.30	15.9
3. Gladstone	3.61	3.3	3. Ingham	4.14	12.6
4. Ingham	3.85	10.4	4. Miami	4.23	19.1
5. Woodridge	4.66	14.6	5. Gladstone	5.89	1.7
6. Mount Isa	6.14	2.3	6. Woodridge	5.91	9.3
7. Emerald	6.28	1.2	7. Goondiwindi	6.08	2.2
8. Mount Garnett	6.92	0.7	8. Mount Isa	7.08	1.6
9. Thursday Island	8.44	2.4	9. Blackwater	7.83	0.5
10. Thargomindah	8.59	0.1	10. Thursday Island	7.97	2.7

[1] Highest rank is 1 and lowest is 10.

TABLE 2.8: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF AVAILABILITY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION, BY AGE AND MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER

		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION				Weighted N
		Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Age [a]	Under 26	40.4	19.9	3.9	35.8	348
	26–35	57.3	12.6	6.7	23.5	318
	36–45	84.1	7.3	3.1	5.5	121
	46–55	43.3	9.6	0.2	46.9	58
	56–65	50.8	32.4	0.0	16.8	36
Marital Status [b]	Single	35.4	17.6	1.0	46.0	251
	Married	60.4	14.9	5.9	18.8	586
	Widowed	50.5	12.4	0.0	37.2	15
	Separated	52.7	17.3	5.8	24.3	32

[a] $x^2 = 103.78$; d.f. = 12; $p < .001$

[b] $x^2 = 81.01$; d.f. = 9; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.9: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF AVAILABILITY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT FOR CHILDREN, BY FAMILY OF TEACHER

Influence in choice of teaching location	Family	PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT FOR CHILDREN				Weighted N
		Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Availability of Secondary Schooling [a]	Children	73.0	12.3	7.5	7.2	330
	No Children	44.5	15.7	3.2	36.6	352
Employment or Tertiary Education for Children [b]	Children	58.5	19.7	12.9	8.9	328
	No Children	29.6	23.0	7.9	39.5	354

[a] $x^2 = 97.36$; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

[b] $x^2 = 101.99$; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.10: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF CHILDREN'S EMPLOYMENT OR TERTIARY EDUCATION, BY AGE AND MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER

		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF CHILDREN'S EMPLOYMENT OR TERTIARY EDUCATION				Weighted N
		Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Age [a]	Under 26	23.4	26.3	11.0	39.4	350
	26–35	43.6	18.6	10.3	27.6	318
	36–45	48.9	15.6	6.5	9.0	119
	46–55	35.7	24.4	0.2	39.6	58
	56–65	45.0	21.5	16.7	16.7	36
Marital Status [b]	Single	19.3	22.6	7.5	50.6	251
	Married	46.0	22.4	10.6	21.0	586
	Widowed	50.5	12.4	12.4	24.8	15
	Separated	41.2	11.5	11.5	35.8	32

[a] $\chi^2 = 100.25$; d.f. = 12; $p < .001$

[b] $\chi^2 = 89.36$; d.f. = 9; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.11: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF COST OF LIVING, BY SEX, AND SPOUSE INFORMATION OF TEACHER, AND LOCATION OF SCHOOL

Background Variable		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF COST OF LIVING				Weighted N
		Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Sex [a]	Male	49.7	34.6	10.6	5.1	403
	Female	32.6	37.2	20.9	9.3	494
Location of School [b]	Brisbane	45.4	30.7	15.9	8.0	286
	Large Coastal Town	38.5	43.1	16.1	2.3	166
	Small Coastal Town	43.8	26.6	22.7	6.9	109
	Large Inland Town	34.6	35.2	16.3	13.9	149
	Small Inland Town	36.5	45.4	13.0	5.2	77
	Rural District	37.8	40.8	13.8	7.5	107
Spouse Information [c]	Spouse is a teacher	44.3	36.7	9.8	9.2	164
	Spouse has other employment	33.8	42.0	17.5	6.7	263
	Spouse is unemployed	56.9	27.9	12.6	2.6	168

[a] $\chi^2 = 35.93$; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

[b] $\chi^2 = 32.17$; d.f. = 15; $p < .01$

[c] $\chi^2 = 28.86$; d.f. = 6; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.12: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT, BY MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER

Marital Status of Teacher	PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT				Weighted N
	Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Single	29.9	16.8	3.9	49.3	251
Married	58.6	8.9	12.0	20.5	590
Widowed	24.8	0	0	75.2	15
Separated	18.3	0.4	0.4	80.8	31

x^2 = 160.03; d.f. = 9; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.13: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT, BY SEX, AGE, FAMILY AND SCHOOL STATUS OF TEACHER

Background factor		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SPOUSE EMPLOYMENT				Weighted N
		Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Sex [a]	Male	23.3	15.7	13.2	42.7	401
	Female	68.9	6.5	1.7	22.9	486
Age [b]	Under 26	56.6	12.8	4.8	25.8	350
	26–35	48.7	11.0	11.1	29.2	320
	36–45	44.2	8.6	15.7	31.5	121
	46–55	31.7	3.7	3.4	61.1	58
	56–65	12.0	0.8	21.6	65.7	36
Family [c]	Children	44.0	10.2	14.6	31.2	330
	No Children	61.9	7.0	6.0	25.2	355
School Status [d]	Principal	12.8	11.6	13.7	61.9	83
	Deputy, Senior Mistress	35.3	11.8	11.8	41.2	32
	Subject Master, Infant Mistress	36.8	21.1	21.1	21.1	35
	Teacher	54.1	10.8	7.7	27.5	686
	Others	40.2	0.0	12.0	47.9	47

[a] x^2 = 204.48; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

[b] x^2 = 81.81; d.f. = 12; $p < .001$

[c] x^2 = 27.07; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

[d] x^2 = 80.57; d.f. = 12; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.14: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF CULTURAL AND PROFESSIONAL FACILITIES, BY SEX, AGE, AND SCHOOL STATUS OF TEACHER, AND LOCATION OF SCHOOL

		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF CULTURAL AND PROFESSIONAL FACILITIES				Weighted N
		Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Sex [a]	Male	21.0	39.2	28.1	11.7	401
	Female	24.3	43.2	28.2	4.3	490
Age [b]	Under 26	28.6	39.5	28.7	3.1	355
	26–35	20.2	39.4	28.9	11.5	322
	36–45	18.8	48.7	22.5	10.0	119
	46–55	20.2	38.9	33.8	7.1	58
	56–65	6.0	60.1	27.4	6.4	35
School Status [c]	Principal	12.4	39.8	38.8	8.9	83
	Deputy, Senior Mistress	23.5	58.8	17.6	0.0	32
	Subject Master, Infant Mistress	25.0	45.0	15.0	15.0	37
	Teacher	24.8	39.6	28.4	7.1	692
	Others	8.6	54.1	24.8	12.4	45
Location of School [d]	Brisbane	28.7	38.7	27.3	5.3	282
	Large Coastal Town	25.9	52.3	15.0	6.8	166
	Small Coastal Town	23.5	33.8	30.2	12.5	107
	Large Inland Town	14.1	43.2	33.9	8.8	149
	Small Inland Town	23.0	32.2	39.9	5.0	77
	Rural District	16.2	44.6	30.2	8.9	107

[a] $X^2 = 17.29$; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

[b] $X^2 = 36.05$; d.f. = 12; $p < .001$

[c] $X^2 = 27.90$; d.f. = 12; $p < .01$

[d] $X^2 = 43.51$; d.f. = 15; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.15: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF LOCALITY ALLOWANCE, BY SEX OF TEACHER

Sex of teacher	PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF LOCALITY ALLOWANCE				Weighted N
	Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Male	34.2	25.0	21.5	19.3	402
Female	23.6	28.9	25.9	21.6	494

$X^2 = 12.40$; d.f. = 3; $p < .005$

TABLE 2.16: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS INFLUENCING TRANSFER, BY QUEENSLAND AND SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TEACHERS

Factors		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS				X^2 (d.f. = 3)
		Very Important %	Quite Important %	Slightly Important %	Not Important %	
Climate	Qld	14.7	39.7	32.6	13.0	5.68
	S.A.	11.3	38.5	35.9	13.9	
Socio-economic character of locality	Qld	9.9	39.1	34.0	17.0	5.70
	S.A.	12.9	39.4	32.9	14.5	
Proximity to Cultural, Professional Facilities	Qld	22.8	41.6	28.0	7.6	6.54
	S.A.	26.3	43.1	23.3	6.9	
Proximity to Church facilities	Qld	6.2	13.2	28.8	51.7	17.16*
	S.A.	4.8	13.4	21.4	60.0	
Proximity to Sporting Facilities	Qld	7.1	26.2	32.2	34.5	10.95*
	S.A.	10.4	29.0	30.8	29.3	
Proximity to General Recreational Facilities	Qld	12.0	43.9	34.0	10.1	7.98
	S.A.	14.6	44.9	27.7	10.5	
Proximity to Family	Qld	26.4	30.0	28.1	15.4	1.59
	S.A.	28.1	31.0	26.2	14.3	
Employment for Spouse	Qld	48.6	10.7	9.2	31.5	11.10*
	S.A.	41.6	12.5	8.1	37.5	
Availability of Secondary Schooling	Qld	53.2	15.5	4.4	26.9	111.23†
	S.A.	30.5	14.7	5.8	48.5	
Employment/Tertiary Education for Children	Qld	38.6	21.7	9.8	29.8	98.22†
	S.A.	23.5	14.9	9.0	52.2	
Locality Allowance	Qld	28.2	27.1	24.1	20.6	104.16†
	S.A.	12.9	21.7	27.0	38.0	
Cost of Living	Qld	40.3	36.0	16.5	7.2	149.49†
	S.A.	19.0	35.2	27.2	19.3	

* Significant at .005 level
† Significant at .001 level

TABLE 2.17: CORRELATIONS AMONG PREFERENCES FOR TRANSFER LOCALITY AND FACTORS INFLUENCING TRANSFER–PRIMARY, PRE-SCHOOL AND SPECIAL TEACHERS

TRANSFER INFLUENCE	TRANSFER PREFERENCES									
	Toowoomba	Maryborough	Gladstone	Ingham	Woodridge	Mt Isa	Emerald	Mt Garnett	Thursday Island	Thargomindah
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Secondary schooling for children	.14									
Employment, tertiary education for children	.13									
Cost of living	.13								−.15	
Employment for spouse										
Cultural, professional facilities	.21				−.18	−.14	−.14			
Proximity to friends, family	.17			−.15	.23	−.13			−.16	
Locality allowance										
General recreational facilities										
Climate		.15				−.18				
Socioeconomic character of locality										
Sporting facilities										
Church facilities										

Note: Only correlations significant at .001 level have been reported in this table.

TABLE 2.18: CORRELATIONS AMONG PREFERENCES FOR TRANSFER LOCALITY AND FACTORS INFLUENCING TRANSFER–SECONDARY TEACHERS

TRANSFER INFLUENCE	TRANSFER PREFERENCES									
	Toowoomba	Maryborough	Ingham	Miami	Gladstone	Woodridge	Goondiwindi	Mt Isa	Blackwater	Thursday Island
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Secondary schooling for children				.19				−.16		
Employment, tertiary education for children		.18		.19						
Cost of living				.25			−.21			
Employment for spouse										−.17
Cultural, professional facilities	.25		−.33	.26		.19	−17		−.15	−.21
Proximity to friends, family			−.25	.23	.31	.36	−.27	−.21		−.38
Locality allowance				.19			−.15			
General recreational facilities				.18		.19				
Climate										
Socioeconomic character of locality										−.17
Sporting facilities							−.16			−.16
Church facilities										−.16

Note. – Only correlations significant at .001 level have been reported in this table.

TABLE 2.19: ATTITUDES TO A POINTS SYSTEM, BY LOCATION OF SCHOOL

LOCATION OF SCHOOL	ATTITUDES TO A POINTS SYSTEM		WEIGHTED
	In Favour %	Not in Favour %	N
Brisbane	57.1	42.9	261
Large Coastal Town	63.4	36.6	157
Small Coastal Town	63.1	36.9	103
Large Inland Town	66.9	33.1	143
Small Inland Town	80.4	19.6	71
Small Rural District	70.9	29.1	102

$x^2 = 16.41$; d.f. = 5; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.20: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SALARY LOADING AS AN INCENTIVE, BY AGE AND LOCATION OF SCHOOL OF TEACHER

TEACHER VARIABLE		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SALARY LOADING				WEIGHTED N
		Powerful Incentive %	Fairly Strong Incentive %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Age[a]	Under 26	52.6	37.4	8.3	1.8	357
	26–35	59.9	27.9	9.8	2.4	324
	36–45	57.9	23.1	14.0	5.0	121
	46–55	46.1	30.5	16.7	6.6	58
	56–65	65.8	16.7	11.9	5.6	36
Location of School[b]	Brisbane	61.4	24.0	11.3	3.4	282
	Large Coastal Town	60.4	29.5	10.0	0.0	168
	Small Coastal Town	45.0	39.1	12.5	3.5	107
	Large Inland Town	63.9	22.4	10.0	3.7	151
	Small Inland Town	43.3	42.8	13.5	0.4	77
	Rural District	43.4	44.5	7.4	4.7	105

[a] $x^2 = 26.72$; d.f. = 12; $p < .01$

[b] $x^2 = 42.55$; d.f. = 15; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.21: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SALARY LOADING, BY LOCATION OF SCHOOL OF TEACHERS AGED 26–35 YEARS OLD

LOCATION OF SCHOOL	PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF SALARY LOADING				WEIGHTED N
	Powerful Influence %	Fairly Strong Influence %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Brisbane	70.2	18.6	11.2	0.0	101
Large Coastal Town	63.6	27.4	9.0	0.0	62
Small Coastal Town	50.5	37.9	7.8	3.8	50
Large Inland Town	66.8	16.7	13.2	3.3	57
Small Inland Town	43.5	52.1	3.5	0.9	15
Rural District	37.4	49.1	7.7	5.8	37

$x^2 = 33.00$; d.f. = 15; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.22: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF EXTRA LONG SERVICE LEAVE AS AN INCENTIVE, BY SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER

TEACHERS VARIABLES		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF EXTRA LONG SERVICE LEAVE				WEIGHTED N
		Powerful Influence %	Fairly Strong Influence %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Sex[a]	Male	40.6	31.1	21.3	7.0	401
	Female	45.0	37.1	12.0	5.9	500
Marital Status[b]	Single	37.6	34.6	20.9	6.8	262
	Married	45.2	33.4	15.0	6.4	590
	Widowed	12.4	74.3	0.9	12.4	15
	Separated	56.2	32.9	10.8	0.0	34

[a] $x^2 = 15.74$; d.f. = 3; $p < .01$

[b] $x^2 = 24.18$; d.f. = 9; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.23: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF TRAVEL CONCESSIONS AS AN INCENTIVE, BY MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER AND LOCATION OF SCHOOL

TEACHER VARIABLES		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF TRAVEL CONCESSIONS				WEIGHTED N
		Poweful Influence %	Fairly Strong Influence %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Marital Status[a]	Single	48.6	32.3	14.3	4.7	263
	Married	43.7	28.5	20.5	7.3	588
	Widowed	24.8	25.7	49.5	0.0	15
	Separated	48.0	40.6	11.5	0.0	33
Location of School[b]	Brisbane	48.1	25.0	21.0	5.9	286
	Large Coastal Town	51.9	31.9	11.7	4.5	166
	Small Coastal Town	35.3	40.4	17.4	6.9	109
	Large Inland Town	36.4	28.7	26.1	8.8	151
	Small Inland Town	35.6	46.2	13.1	5.1	75
	Rural District	53.3	22.0	20.7	4.0	107

[a] $x^2 = 21.85$; d.f. = 9; $p < .01$ [b] $x^2 = 40.11$; d.f. = 15; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.24: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION CONCESSIONS AS AN INCENTIVE, BY TEACHER'S MARITAL STATUS AND FAMILY

TEACHER VARIABLE		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION CONCESSIONS				WEIGHTED N
		Powerful Incentive %	Fairly Strong Incentive %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Marital Status[a]	Single	19.8	29.1	16.9	34.1	257
	Married	38.0	31.1	19.7	11.2	588
	Widowed	37.2	24.8	0.9	37.2	15
	Separated	31.9	24.4	18.8	24.9	31
Family[b]	Children	43.1	30.2	19.9	6.8	328
	No Children	28.6	32.2	18.0	21.2	357

[a] $x^2 = 75.91$; d.f. = 9; $p < .001$

[b] $x^2 = 35.49$; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.25: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF LOW INTEREST GOVERNMENT LOAN AS AN INCENTIVE, BY MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER

Marital Status	PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF LOW INTEREST GOVERNMENT LOAN				WEIGHTED N
	Powerful Incentive %	Fairly Strong Incentive %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Single	25.3	27.3	28.6	18.8	263
Married	44.1	28.4	17.8	9.7	588
Widowed	13.3	37.2	24.8	24.8	15
Separated	41.4	24.2	22.9	11.5	33

$x^2 = 44.01$; d.f. = 9; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.26: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL FACILITIES AS AN INCENTIVE, BY SEX AND AGE OF TEACHER

TEACHER VARIABLE		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL FACILITIES				WEIGHTED N
		Powerful Incentive %	Fairly Strong Incentive %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Sex [a]	Male	14.0	36.7	35.5	13.8	399
	Female	24.7	42.7	26.2	6.4	500
Age [b]	Under 26	22.9	42.3	26.6	8.3	355
	26–35	21.3	36.0	34.9	7.9	326
	36–45	15.2	37.3	33.4	14.1	121
	46–55	13.8	38.2	28.3	19.8	58
	56–65	6.7	64.3	23.8	5.2	36

[a] $x^2 = 33.60$; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

[b] $x^2 = 30.76$; d.f. = 12; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.27: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF ACCELERATED PROMOTION AS AN INCENTIVE BY, SEX OF TEACHER

SEX OF TEACHER	PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF ACCELERATED PROMOTION				WEIGHTED N
	Powerful Incentive %	Fairly Strong Incentive %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Male	27.8	27.6	28.8	15.8	399
Female	17.8	32.8	26.8	22.6	500

x^2 = 17.68; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.28: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF A POINTS SYSTEM AS AN INCENTIVE BY SCHOOL STATUS OF TEACHER

SCHOOL STATUS	PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF A POINTS SYSTEM				WEIGHTED N
	Powerful Incentive %	Fairly Strong Incentive %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Principal	20.6	47.4	23.6	8.4	81
Deputy Principal	22.2	44.4	27.8	5.6	34
Subject Master	4.8	42.9	23.8	28.6	39
Class Teacher	15.0	32.0	32.4	20.6	685
Others	16.9	33.4	24.8	24.8	45

x^2 = 26.82; d.f. = 12; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.29: PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF INCENTIVES, BY QUEENSLAND AND SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TEACHERS

INCENTIVES		PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF INCENTIVES				x^2 (d.f.=3)
		Powerful Incentive %	Fairly Strong Incentive %	Slight Influence %	No Influence %	
Salary Loading	Qld	55.9	30.7	10.7	2.7	68.91*
	S.A.	38.5	35.4	18.6	7.1	
Low Rent House or Flat	Qld	53.9	32.7	10.7	2.6	20.89*
	S.A.	47.8	32.7	12.3	6.7	
Extra Long Service Leave	Qld	42.9	34.5	16.2	6.4	28.58*
	S.A.	33.8	32.7	23.1	10.1	
Low Interest Government Loan	Qld	38.3	28.1	20.9	12.7	32.52*
	S.A.	28.5	26.3	24.3	20.6	
Excellent School Facilities	Qld	24.0	49.0	19.7	7.3	15.34*
	S.A.	31.4	41.4	20.6	6.2	
Regional Centre for Professional Facilities	Qld	20.2	39.9	30.2	9.7	4.59
	S.A.	22.1	35.3	30.8	11.4	
Accelerated Promotion	Qld	22.3	30.4	27.5	19.9	11.25
	S.A.	28.3	28.3	22.7	20.4	

* $p < .005$

TABLE 2.30: ATTITUDES TO UNIVERSITY STUDIES AS A SUFFICIENT REASON FOR EXEMPTION FROM TRANSFER, BY AGE, SEX AND SPOUSE INFORMATION OF TEACHER

TEACHER VARIABLES		UNIVERSITY STUDIES AS AN EXEMPTION		WEIGHTED N
		YES %	NO %	
Age[a]	Under 26	87.9	12.1	354
	26–35	74.9	25.1	323
	36–45	79.9	20.1	121
	46–55	87.2	12.8	54
	56–65	61.7	38.3	36
Sex [b]	Male	74.3	25.7	400
	Female	86.1	13.9	490
Spouse Information[c]	Spouse is a teacher	77.3	22.7	162
	Spouse is employed elsewhere	83.7	16.3	262
	Spouse unemployed	69.5	30.5	167

[a] $\chi^2 = 28.90$; d.f. = 4; $p < .001$

[b] $\chi^2 = 19.26$; d.f. = 1; $p < .001$

[c] $\chi^2 = 12.01$; d.f. = 2; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.31: ATTITUDES TO UNIVERSITY STUDIES AS A SUFFICENT REASON FOR EXEMPTION, BY LOCATION OF SCHOOL BY AGE OF TEACHER– TEACHERS UNDER 26 YEARS OF AGE

LOCATION OF SCHOOL	UNIVERSITY STUDIES AS AN EXEMPTION		WEIGHTED N
	YES %	NO %	
Brisbane	77.9	22.1	101
Large Coastal Town	96.5	3.5	57
Small Coastal Town	95.0	5.0	40
Large Inland Town	90.7	9.3	60
Small Inland Town	87.3	12.7	46
Small Rural District	88.8	11.2	46

$\chi^2 = 15.76$; d.f. = 5; $p < .01$

TABLE 2.32: ATTITUDES TO EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN AS A SUFFICIENT REASON FOR TRANSFER BY AGE, SEX, MARITAL STATUS AND FAMILY OF TEACHER

TEACHER VARIABLE		EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF CHILDREN AS EXEMPTION		WEIGHTED N
		YES %	NO %	
Age [a]	Under 26	71.8	28.2	353
	26–35	77.3	22.7	322
	36–45	87.0	13.0	121
	46–55	89.3	10.7	56
	56–65	83.2	16.8	34
Sex [b]	Male	82.3	17.7	401
	Female	73.1	26.9	486
Marital Status [c]	Single	70.8	29.2	260
	Married	79.8	20.2	586
	Widowed	100.0	0.0	13
	Separated	75.1	24.9	31
Family [d]	Children	85.9	14.1	326
	No Children	72.4	27.6	357

[a] $\chi^2 = 17.78$; d.f. = 4; $p < .01$
[b] $\chi^2 = 10.01$; d.f. = 1; $p < .01$
[c] $\chi^2 = 12.19$; d.f. = 3; $p < .01$
[d] $\chi^2 = 17.58$; d.f. = 1; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.33: ATTITUDES TO MARRIAGE OF FEMALES AS A SUFFICIENT REASON FOR EXEMPTION FROM TRANSFER, BY SEX, AGE AND SPOUSE INFORMATION OF TEACHER

TEACHER VARIABLE		MARRIAGE OF FEMALES AS AN EXEMPTION		WEIGHTED N
		YES %	NO %	
Sex [a]	Male	56.7	43.3	396
	Female	80.4	19.6	488
Age [b]	Under 26	76.6	23.4	356
	26–35	67.5	32.5	319
	36–45	63.3	56.7	119
	46–55	66.1	33.9	54
	56–65	52.5	47.5	34
Spouse Information [c]	Spouse a teacher	68.2	31.8	159
	Spouse employed elsewhere	85.2	14.8	261
	Spouse unemployed	53.2	46.8	166

[a] $\chi^2 = 56.18$; d.f. = 1; $p < .001$
[b] $\chi^2 = 16.13$; d.f. = 4; $p < .01$
[c] $\chi^2 = 52.17$; d.f. = 2; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.34: ATTITUDES TO MARRIAGE OF MALES AS A SUFFICIENT REASON FOR EXEMPTION FROM TRANSFER, BY AGE AND FAMILY OF TEACHER

TEACHER VARIABLE		MARRIAGE OF MALES AS AN EXEMPTION		WEIGHTED N
		YES %	NO %	
Age [a]	Under 26	43.7	56.3	349
	26–35	25.6	74.4	305
	36–45	15.7	84.3	115
	46–55	7.4	92.6	54
	56–65	5.8	94.2	32
Family [b]	Children	20.3	79.7	311
	No Children	36.1	63.9	344

[a] $x^2 = 67.74$; d.f. = 4; $p < .001$

[b] $x^2 = 19.14$; d.f. = 1; $p < .001$

TABLE 2.35. ATTITUDES TO PREFERENCE FOR CITY LOCATION AS A SUFFICIENT REASON FOR EXEMPTION FROM TRANSFER, BY AGE AND MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHER

TEACHER VARIABLE		PREFERENCE FOR CITY LOCATION AS AN EXEMPTION		WEIGHTED N
		YES %	NO %	
Age [a]	Under 26	26.4	73.6	349
	26–35	12.2	87.8	309
	36–45	13.6	86.4	117
	46–55	4.0	96.0	54
	56–65	0.0	100.0	34
Marital Status [b]	Single	27.5	72.5	255
	Married	13.0	87.0	565
	Widowed	14.1	85.9	13
	Separated	17.3	82.7	32

[a] $x^2 = 41.02$; d.f. = 4; $p < .001$

[b] $x^2 = 25.76$; d.f. = 3; $p < .001$

Govt Printer, Brisbane (P/L) 7-76